



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
88/111,411	07/08/96	WOLD	W 16153-5587

RONALD R. HOLLAND
HOWELL AND HAERKAMP LC
1710 FORSYTH
SUITE 1400
ST LOUIS MO 63105

HM22/1219

EXAMINER

LEE, G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1632

DATE MAILED:

12/19/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/111,911

Applicant(s)

WOLD

Examiner

Gai (Jennifer) Mi Lee

Group Art Unit
1632



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Gai (Jennifer) Mi Lee

(3) Mr. Elie Gendloff

(2) Ms. Karen Hauda

(4) Dr. Wold

Date of Interview Dec 13, 2000

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: Claim 1

Identification of prior art discussed:

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Examiner and Applicant discussed enablement issues pertaining to in vitro, ex vivo, or in vivo methodology of the instant invention or RID complex. Applicant and Examiner further discussed the two forms of therapeutic use between a protein and a polynucleotide forms of the RID complex. Examiner further suggested Applicant to consider canceling protein claims to reduce the number of enablement issues.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Karen M. Hauda
KAREN M. HAUDA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.